## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

THOMAS DANIEL STROW,	)
Petitioner,	No. C 08-0629 CRB (PR)
VS.	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
M. MARTEL, Warden,	) (Doc # 2)
Respondent.	
	)

Petitioner, a state prisoner incarcerated at Mule Creek State Prison in Ione, California, has filed a pro se petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. He also seeks to proceed in forma pauperis under 28 U.S.C. § 1915.

## BACKGROUND

Petitioner pleaded guilty to ten counts of lewd or lascivious conduct with a child under the age of fourteen in Humboldt County superior court. On August 11, 2004, he was sentenced to 21 years in state prison.

Petitioner unsuccessfully appealed his conviction to the California Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court of California. He also sought collateral relief from the state courts. On July 11, 2007, the Supreme Court of California denied his final petition for state habeas relief.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

## **DISCUSSION**

#### Α. Standard of Review

This court may entertain a petition for a writ of habeas corpus "in behalf of a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court only on the ground that he is in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States." 28 U.S.C. § 2254(a).

It shall "award the writ or issue an order directing the respondent to show cause why the writ should not be granted, unless it appears from the application that the applicant or person detained is not entitled thereto." <u>Id.</u> § 2243.

#### В. Claims

Petitioner seeks federal habeas corpus relief by raising several claims for relief, including invalid plea due to ineffective assistance of counsel, excessive and disproportionate sentence, and prosecutorial misconduct during sentencing. Liberally construed, the claims appear cognizable under § 2254 and merit an answer from respondent. See Zichko v. Idaho, 247 F.3d 1015, 1020 (9th Cir. 2001) (federal courts must construe pro se petitions for writs of habeas corpus liberally).

## CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons and for good cause shown,

- 1. Petitioner's request to proceed in forma pauperis (doc # 2) is GRANTED.
- 2. The clerk shall serve by certified mail a copy of this order and the petition and all attachments thereto on respondent and respondent's attorney, the Attorney General of the State of California. The clerk also shall serve a copy of this order on petitioner.

/

27

28

3. Respondent shall file with the court and serve on petitioner, within 60 days of the issuance of this order, an answer conforming in all respects to Rule 5 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, showing cause why a writ of habeas corpus should not be granted. Respondent shall file with the answer and serve on petitioner a copy of all portions of the state trial record that have been transcribed previously and that are relevant to a determination of the issues presented by the petition.

If petitioner wishes to respond to the answer, he shall do so by filing a traverse with the court and serving it on respondent within 30 days of his receipt of the answer.

- 4. Respondent may file a motion to dismiss on procedural grounds in lieu of an answer, as set forth in the Advisory Committee Notes to Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. If respondent files such a motion, petitioner shall file with the court and serve on respondent an opposition or statement of non-opposition within 30 days of receipt of the motion, and respondent shall file with the court and serve on petitioner a reply within 15 days of receipt of any opposition.
- 5. Petitioner is reminded that all communications with the court must be served on respondent by mailing a true copy of the document to respondent's counsel. Petitioner must also keep the court and all parties informed of any change of address.

SO ORDERED.

DATED: May 27, 2008

CHARLES R. BREYER United States District Judge

28

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE

### NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

THOMAS D. STROW,	Case Number: CV08-00629 CRB
Plaintiff,	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
v.	
M. MARTEL et al,	
Defendant.	/

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California.

That on May 27, 2008, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing said envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery receptacle located in the Clerk's office.

Thomas D. Strow V47104 Mule Creek State Prison P.O. Box 409060 Ione, CA 95640

Attorney General of the State of California 455 Golden Gate Avenue Ste. 11000 San Francisco, CA 94102

Dated: May 27, 2008

Richard W. Wieking, Clerk By: Barbara Espinoza, Deputy Clerk